



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,708	12/31/2001	Knut Adams	1454.1102	7003

21171 7590 11/02/2005
STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

MANCHO, RONNIE M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3663

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/937,708

Applicant(s)

ADAMS ET AL

Examiner

Ronnie Mancho

Art Unit

3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 0 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-25 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-25 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status

1. This is a first office action in response to the RCE filed 10/20/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

1. Claims 16-25, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Westerlage et al (6295449)

Regarding claim 1, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose an apparatus (216, 224; figs. 5&7) for data acquisition for a control center 226 (figs. 5, 6), the apparatus (216, 224) comprising:

Art Unit: 3663

a control and monitoring system (system 300-302 in unit 224, fig. 8; col. 22, lines 31-36, lines 57-60) directly controlling (col. 22, lines 31-36, lines 57-60) operational states of a device (pager/remote ringer; col. 22, lines 31-36, lines 57-60), the device (pager/remote ringer; col. 22, lines 31-36, lines 57-60) coupled to said control apparatus (216, 224) via control signals (wireless control signals, figs. 5, 6);

at least one input interface (238, 240, 266, 272-276, etc; fig. 7) for supplying input signals;

a transmitting/receiving unit 218 (figs. 5&6);

a signal processing apparatus 246 (col. 16, lines 25-45) coupled to the input interface (238, 240, 266, 272-276, etc; fig. 7) for signal processing of the input signals to derive output data in accordance with a first set of predetermined rules, said signal processing unit 246 including a data analysis unit to record (col. 16, lines 25-45) selected input signals at predetermined times in accordance with recording rules defined in advance by the control center (DTMF or modem data, fig. 8, col. 16, lines 20-38) for short-term monitoring of information derived from the input signals; and

an output interface 216 (col. 7, lines 53-65; col. 16, lines 25-45), coupled to the signal processing unit 246, for supplying the output data (see wireless link, figs. 5-7) from said signal processing unit 246 to said transmitting/receiving unit 218 (figs. 5&6) for at least one of automatic transmission or transmission initiated on request.

Regarding claim 17, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 16, further comprising at least one writeable memory for storage of an operating system for the apparatus and the recording rules remotely loaded via the transmitting/receiving unit.

Art Unit: 3663

Regarding claim 18, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 16, characterized in that the apparatus has a data converter, which is arranged between the input interface and the signal processing unit and which is used for removing distortion from the supplied input signals and for providing a standard data format for the input signals.

Regarding claim 19, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 18, characterized in that the apparatus has an address allocation unit, which is provided between the data converter and the input interface, and is intended for conversion of a source-specific addresses of the input signals to the address format of the data converter.

Regarding claim 20, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 16, wherein the apparatus is installed in a mobile vehicle which is operated by a motor or engine, and has a generator of a supply voltage, and

wherein the apparatus further comprises:

a power supply connection (figs. 1&7) coupled to the generator of the supply voltage in the vehicle, said transmitting/receiving unit and said signal processing unit; and

a detection unit, coupled to said power supply connection and to said data analysis unit, to detect at least whether the generator of the supply voltage source is in operation, and to interrupt said data analysis unit when the generator of the supply voltage source is not in operation.

Regarding claim 21, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 20 further comprising a memory, coupled to the signal processing unit, to store a second set of predetermined rules, and wherein said signal processing unit further comprises a data

Art Unit: 3663

processing unit to record information data derived from the input signals in accordance with the second set of predetermined rules.

Regarding claim 22 (as best understood), Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 21, wherein said memory further comprises a first memory area containing predetermined rules for keeping the supply voltage source in operating mode, and a second memory area containing predetermined rules for not keeping the supply voltage source in operating mode.

Regarding claim 23, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 21, wherein the signal processing apparatus has an alarm unit, coupled to said memory and to said data processing unit, for monitoring information data derived from the input signals in accordance with predetermined alarm rules, and wherein the apparatus further comprises a memory to store predetermined rules for the alarm unit.

Regarding claim 24, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 23, characterized in that the apparatus has an alarm archive for storing information on alarms that have occurred.

Regarding claim 25 Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 21, characterized in that the signal processing unit includes a monitoring unit, coupled to said at least one input interface, for monitoring of the input signals and the information data.

Regarding claim 27, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 16 further comprising a GPS interface to connect the apparatus to a GPS receiver.

Regarding claim 28, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 16, wherein the input signals are operating data relating to one of a vehicle and a machine.

Regarding claim 29, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 28; characterized in that the apparatus is integrated in a car radio receiver and in a car radio receiver/mobile telephone appliance.

Regarding claim 30, Westerlage et al (figs. 5-12) disclose the apparatus as claimed in claim 16, wherein said transmitting/receiving unit transmits the output data to at least one of the control center and a predetermined receiver.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/20/05 have been fully considered but they are not all persuasive.

The applicant is arguing that the prior art, Westerlage does not disclose "a single apparatus as recited in the claims". The examiner disagrees. After carefully combing and going through the claims, the examiner did not find any limitation that suggests or narrows the claims to read "a single apparatus". The applicant does not explain the meaning of single apparatus in the context of the disclosure. Thus any arguments related to "a single apparatus" as urged by the applicant are way out off the tangent in relation to the present case and will not be further addressed since such a limitation is not part of the current claims.

The applicant further argues about the examiner using a combination of references to make a hindsight rejection. The examiner is appalled by such accusations since there was no obviousness rejection or any combination of references used in the rejections.

Art Unit: 3663

Next the applicant asks for an explanation on how a modem acts as a control and monitoring system to control the operational states of a device as claimed. Well, a modem modulates/demodulates signals, and also determines the speed at which data is uploaded/downloaded thus controlling the performance of a device. In the word, modem, --mo-- stands for modulation and --dem-- stands for demodulation.

Next, the applicant requests that the examiner should call the applicant for an interview to discuss amending the claims before issuing another action to the present case, that is if the examiner believes that the prior art still reads on the claims. Well, the examiner will have loved to call the applicant for an interview, but due to the work load and time constraints, the examiner will not be able to make such a phone call at this time. In addition, the examiner knows of no further amendments to suggest to the applicant at this time. If the applicant believes that there is an amendment that could be made, then the applicant is welcomed to call and arrange for an interview.

It is believed that the rejection is proper. Thus limitations in pending claims 16-25, 27-30 are believed to be disclosed by the prior art.

Communication

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronnie Mancho whose telephone number is 571-272-6984. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs: 9-5.

Art Unit: 3663

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

10/29/05

Mark J. Heller
Primary Examiner